



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON SALINAN AND WASHO

By E. SAPIR

When my paper on Hokan and Coahuiltecan¹ was first written, Salinan seemed only doubtfully Hokan. I therefore relegated the six or seven Salinan-Coahuiltecan parallels that were then at my disposal to the footnotes (see nos. 3, 4, 5, 31, 47, 54, 103). Even of these no. 47 (Salinan *le'm*) must be considered very doubtful at best. A little later, when I was preparing my paper on *The Position of Yana in the Hokan Stock*, Dr. J. A. Mason put further Salinan manuscript data at my disposal. The Hokan affiliation of the language seemed to become more and more probable and I had little hesitation in entering the increasing number of Salinan parallels in my comparative Hokan lists. In 1918 appeared Dr. Mason's paper on *The Language of the Salinan Indians*², which removed all doubt — at least so it seems to me — as to where Salinan belongs. Salinan is unmistakably Hokan in structural type and resemblances in morphology to Chimariko, Yana, and other Hokan languages suggest themselves at every turn. The agreements with Chimariko are particularly impressive and reveal once more the crucial importance of this language to an understanding of Hokan relationships. Unfortunately our Chimariko record is very fragmentary and is practically certain always to remain so.

Dr. Mason's Salinan vocabulary, which forms Part IV of his paper, enables me to add a number of interesting Salinan-Coahuiltecan lexical parallels. In some of these instances, the Salinan form is a strikingly corroborative bridge

between the Hokan and Coahuiltecan forms already given. This is notably the case with Salinan *cwa'n* FISH (Tonkawa *esva-*; Pomo *ca, aca*); Hokan **iswa-*, **eswa-*. Salinan additions to the preceding entries are as follows.

3. To independent Sal. *ke* (properly *k'e'*) I (see note 3 of comparative vocabulary) add enclitic objective *-ak* ME. This corresponds well with Tonkawa objective *ka* ME.

18. Sal. *ita'l*, *e'tan* SHOULDER, presumably from ARM; cf. also Chim. *b-ita* SHOULDER. Salinan *ita'l* is curiously close to reconstructed Hokan **itali*, which was formed from comparative evidence before this Salinan form was available (see *The Position of Yana in the Hokan Stock*, p. 33).

20. Sal. *icu'*, *ico'* BREAST. But probably this is better put with Chim. *b-usi* BREAST; Chumash *usu'i* CHEST, HEART.

33. Sal. *t-aa'* DEER. *t-* of this and other forms is the prefixed demonstrative element (see note 5; *t-* is Kroeber's orthography for Mason's *t*).

34. Sal. *cwa'n*, *swan*, *cwa'n*, *cowa'n-* FISH.

49. Sal. *na'* SUN.

53. Sal. *k-emil'top* LIGHTNING; *-l-* perhaps frequentative infix in stem- *emito-*.

54. Sal. *-ca* occurs also without demonstrative *t-*, *t-* (*t-ca'*, *tc'a*, *t'-ca'*, *t'-ca'*, *tc'xa'*). Cf. *ca-tole* DEW; *u-ca-t*, *o-ca'-t* TEARS, i.e. EYE-WATER (cf. Pomo *yu-xa*, Chimariko *b-uso'xa*; here Sal. *u-*, *uwu-* from **uyu-*, ordinarily FACE, preserves its original meaning of EYE).

66. Sal. *xa'kic*, *ka'k'cu* TWO.

69. Sal. *maca'l* TO BLAZE, TO BURN.

70. Sal. *-x* HITHER in *ia-x*, *ie-x*, *ix-x* TO COME;

1. See this Journal, 280-290.

2. UCP 14, 1-154.

f. *ia*, *ie* TO GO; Sal. *-x* < *-*k'(i)*. Cf. also Comecrudo *ya-k* TO COME.

75. Sal. *ema't'* TO KILL. Possibly to be analyzed into *ema'-t'* TO CAUSE TO DIE; *-l-*, *-te-* is causative in Salinan.

78. Sal. *amo* TO EAT; *amma* (Sitjar) TO EAT (AS GRUEL), TO SUCK.

79. Sal. *icx*, *icax* TO EAT; from Hokan **ixa-k'*. Salinan regularly changes Hokan *x* to *c*, *s* where Esselen, Shastan, and Karok likewise change it (cf. no 54; also Salinan *t-cik'*, *t-ca'k* KNIFE: Yana *xaga* FLINT, see note 20 of comparative vocabulary), keeps it (as *x* or *k'*) where they keep it (cf. no. 66). Apparently we must reckon with two etymologically distinct *x*-sounds in Hokan, presumably palatal *x* (which tended to become assibilated) and velar *x* (which remained in *k*-position).

93. Sal. *iam*, *iem*, plural *iema'-lt'e'* TO SEE, *iema-t* TO SHOW, i.e. TO CAUSE TO SEE (*-t* is causative). Salinan *iema-* corresponds well to Atsugewi *-ima-* and Comecrudo *imáx*.

97. Sal. *me* to sleep. This goes very well with Comecrudo *n-emé-t*, Karankawa 'm. Presumably these forms are to be disconnected from Hokan **isama-*, **itsama-*.

111. Sal. *-la-*, diminutive suffix. Not explicitly recognized by Mason, but some of his examples seem clear enough: *cxapa-la-t* PEBBLE (cf. *cxap* STONE); *t'o'-l* HEAP (cf. *t'oi* MOUNTAIN); *luane-lo* SLAVE, *luani-la-yo*, OVERSEER, i.e. SLAVE-WARDEN (cf. *lua* MAN).

Of even greater interest here are examples of Salinan-Coahuiltecan for which I am at present unable to find other (or but isolated) Hokan cognates. Our list of Hokan-Coahuiltecan parallels may be thus extended:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 119. Sal. <i>e'ntxt</i> ear | Comecr. <i>ali</i> ;
Atak. <i>an</i> ear |
| 120. Sal. <i>eno'ol</i> , <i>nol</i>
penis | Tonk. <i>nel</i> sexual or-
gans |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 121. Sal. <i>t-itco'mo</i> be-
hind, <i>t-i'tcom'</i>
back | Comecr. <i>semi</i>
after |
| 122. Sal. <i>ia</i> , <i>ie</i> to go;
Ess. <i>iyu</i> to come | Tonk. <i>yaku-</i> ;
Karan. <i>yé</i>
to go |
| 123. Sal. <i>ica'-k</i> , <i>ica</i>
to go, to walk
(from Hokan
<i>*ixa-</i> , cf. no.
79 above) | Tonk. <i>xa'</i> to
go; Coahu.
<i>ka-l</i> to go,
<i>ka-i</i> to walk |
| 124. Sal. <i>xac</i> , plur.
<i>kx' ci-l</i> to sit
down, to be
seated (Hokan
<i>*ik'a-</i>) | Karan. <i>hékés</i> ,
<i>baka</i> to sit;
Atak. <i>ke</i> |
| 125. Sal. <i>k-</i> ; Seri <i>k-</i> ,
intransitive
(better static)
verb prefix | Tonk. <i>k-</i> (e.g.
<i>ko-pol</i> round,
cf. <i>pilil</i> round) |
| 126. Sal. <i>p-</i> , transitive
(better active)
verb prefix | Comecr. <i>pa-</i>
verb prefix
(active?) |

Of these the last two are of peculiar importance, though the available evidence is not full enough to enable me to speak with confidence. In the first place, Mason's account of the function of the Salinan *k-* and *p-* elements does not strike me as quite hitting the mark. He calls them « intransitive » and « transitive » prefixes respectively, yet, as he himself remarks, « many cases are found in which *p-* introduces an intransitive phrase ». An examination of his verb material leads to the feeling that the *k*-prefix primarily characterizes static verbs, i.e. verbs of state, quality (adjectives), and non-agentive process (e. g. to wake up, to snow, it is hot, to be fat), also passives and reflexives (examples of « transitives » with *k-* are probably merely inadequately translated passives, e. g. « they sought him » is to be understood as « he was sought »). Practically all Salinan adjectives have

k-. Verbs with *p-* are evidently active, whether transitive or not (e.g. to think, to circle around, to try, to heat, to wound, to seize). Naturally it is often a matter of idiom whether a verbal idea is conceived of in terms of action or state, but the nature of the Salinan classification of verbs seems clear enough. This classification seems to be a deep-rooted Hokan feature, while the Penutian languages classify their verbs into true transitives and intransitives. Neither Yana nor Chimariko use *k-* or *p-* prefixes, but the distinction of active and static verbs is made by other means. In Chimariko (as in Siouan) they are distinguished by differences of pronominal treatment, in Yana by differences of stem vocalism.

The Seri material, wretched as it is, nevertheless strongly suggests that static verbs (at least adjectives and numerals) are characterized by the same *k*-prefix that we have in Salinan (e.g. *k-eviɬ* RED¹, *k-masoɬ* YELLOW, *k-opoɬ* BLACK, *k-oviɬ* BLUE, GREEN, *k-o'pɬ* WHITE, *k-akoɬ* GREAT, *k-i'pi* GOOD, *k-ax-ku-m*, *k-uxo-m* TWO, *k-osoɬ* FOUR). Variant forms clearly suggest that *k-* is a movable element, e. g. *sox-ku-m* FOUR. This striking Salinan-Seri feature is almost certainly paralleled in Tonkawa *ko-pol* (or *k-opol*) ROUND, as other Hokan-Coahuiltecan cognates (see no. 61 of comparative vocabulary) exhibit the same stem (*pol-*, *pil-*, *-pel*) without the *k-* prefix.

Of Coahuiltecan cognates of Salinan active *p-* I am more doubtful. A considerable number of Comecrudo verbs that contain a prefixed *pa-* or *p-* is of the active type (to burn, to go, to drink, to eat, to jump, to rattle [?], to sing, to whistle). Unfortunately for our hypothesis not a few *p-* verbs are of the static type (black, cold, dead, to lie down², evening, great, lightning, thunder, red, round, to sit, strong, tall, tired, white, to blow [wind]). It is difficult to believe

that all of the latter group are conceived of as active, though some (like to lighten, to thunder, wind blows) may well be. We may surmise that a former active significance of the *p-* prefix was obscured in Comecrudo and that it became a generalized verb prefix that could be used with both voices. On the other hand, an example of the static (adjectival) *k-* seems to be preserved in Comecrudo *kicɬx* SMALL, LITTLE, YOUNG (*k-ica-x*; cf. Tonk. *ca-xun*, Coahu. *ca-n*, Atak. *cka*).

Besides such Salinan forms as have already been recognized as Hokan in the former paper or in the Yana study³, I have noted a number of others that seem worth recording, though they do not directly bear, for the present, on the Hokan relationship of the Coahuiltecan languages. They are the fruit of a merely casual reading of Mason's paper. There is no doubt that a really careful study of Mason's Salinan material by one that has a full body of Yuman or Pomo data to fall back on would yield a considerable harvest. I have noted :

1. Sal. *aton-* YOUNGER SISTER : Ach. *atun* YOUNGER BROTHER (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 123).
2. Sal. *puku* ARM : Chumash *pu* ARM, HAND ; Chim. *-pu* in *h-itan-pu* ARM (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 23).
3. Sal. *acx*, *ad'cx* LIVER : Chim. *h-uci* LIVER.
4. Sal. *icaha'l*, *isxa'l* URINE : Chumash *oxcol* URINE.
5. Sal. *cu'la'-t'*, *so'lo* TESTICLE (Hokan **xq'la-*?) : Pomo *ya-γol* TESTICLES, *da-γol* KIDNEY.
6. Sal. *t'io'i* OAK, possibly to be understood as *t'io'i* THE-ACORN-TREE : Yana *yu-* ACORN (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 141). It may be that this is to be read *-io-i* and that *-i* is a survival in compounds from Hokan *'i-* TREE (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 59). Other Salinan forms suggesting Hokan *'i-* are *k'eso'-i'* TUNA, *ko'i-yi* ROOT, *matai'-yi* MILKWEED, *mo'noi'-yi* TOLQACHE.

3. These do not need to be repeated here.

1. I am interpreting the orthographies of Hewitt's sources as best I can.

2. Possibly the active verb is meant.

7. Sal. *t'-o'*, *t'-o'* PINE NUTS : Yana *wu-na*, *'u-na* PINE NUTS (stem *'u-*).
8. Sal. *t-o'ke* IN, WITHIN (from *-o'xe*; Salinan *k'* and *x*, as correspondents of Hokan *x*, see no. 79 above, seem to interchange constantly) : Hokan **xulu* IN (see Yana-Hokan, no. 176).
9. Sal. *ke-*, locative particle used after prepositions (e. g. *ke-o* HIM, TO HIM, *t-ewa'ko k-e* NEAR ME, lit. THE-NEARNESS TO-ME) : Yana *gi*, objective particle.
10. Sal. *k-etca'* LARGE, GREAT : Yana *-djal-* in *ba-djal*-LARGE (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 9).
11. Sal. *k-its-pilil* PAINTED (for *-its-* cf. *k-itc-ka'-ten* RED, *k-itc-mila* TRANSPARENT, *k-its-tolne* TWISTED) with final reduplication (also *k-i't-pelel* STRIPED) : Yana *p'un-* TO PAINT; Chim. reduplicated *-xolxol-* (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 111).
12. Sal. *k-atulul-na* STRAIGHT (road) : Chim. *h-a'doha-n* STRAIGHT.
13. Sal. *k-esiyu'k'* SWEET : Chim. *h-iqūi-ni* SWEET (read *-ixui-* ?).
14. Sal. *sa'* TO SPEAK, *se'* TO TELL, TO SAY SO, *em-se'k'* HE WHO SPEAKS : Chim. *tc-isit* I SAID (*tc-* is pronominal).
15. Sal. *t'e'*, *t'e'* TO TELL, TO SAY SO : Yana *t'i-* TO SAY.
16. Sal. *k'unip* TO DESIRE : Yana *k'un-* TO LIKE, TO WISH.
17. Sal. *-esno-*, *-esna-* TO HEAR (e.g. *p-esno'-xo*, plur. *p-esnelo'-xo* TO HEAR, TO LISTEN, *p-esna(i)-'ya* HE WAS HEARD, possibly assimilated from **-isma-*, Hokan **isama-* EAR (see Yana-Hokan, no. 76).
18. Sal. *a'm(k)*, *amk* TO KILL : Yana *om'dji-* TO KILL (static form *am'dji-*).
19. Sal. *-atce-* TO SIT (e.g. *k-atce-k* TO SIT DOWN, *t-atce-x* SEAT) : Yana *dju-* TO SIT (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 36).
20. Sal. *a'ke'-n*, *a'ki'-nyr'* TO THINK : Yana *gi-* TO HAVE IN MIND.
21. Sal. *'ames*, *'amas* TO SHOUT, TO CRY : Hokan **imi-* (**ami-* ?) TO CRY (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 82; also no. 72 of Hokan-Coahuiltecan comparative list).
22. Sal. *a'xa-p* TO DIE : Chim. *-ko-* TO DIE; Hokan **ak'a-* (?).
23. Sal. *ma't* TO FILL ONESELF : E. Pomo *madi* TO FILL TIGHT (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 13, where another Salinan form, corresponding to Yana *ba'ni-* TO BE FULL, is better released from comparison with Pomo *madi*).
24. Sal. *oi*, plur. *oyi-l* TO LEARN, TO DETERMINE : Yana, E. Pomo *-yi-* TO TEACH, TO SHOW; Hokan **oyi-* (?).
25. Sal. *om-p*, *o'mo-p*, plur. *omo-lo-p* TO FINISH : Hokan **mu-* (**umu-* ?) TO WORK, TO FIX (cf. Yana-Hokan, no. 89).
26. Sal. *-e-*, *-i-*, makes denominative verbs (e.g. *k-cowa'n-i* TO CATCH FISH from *cwa'n* FISH) : Yana *-i-*, verbalizes noun stems ending in short vowel (e.g. *ba-i-* TO HUNT DEER from *ba-* DEER).
27. Sal. *-ni*, denominative suffix, apparently durative intransitive (e.g. *k-lua-ni* TO BE HUSBANDED from *lua* MAN, NOT TO MARRY A MAN, as Mason has it; *k-* is static); probably identical with adjectival *-ne* (e. g. *ca'xa'-ne* BLUE, cf. plur. *k-ca'xa'-te-na'*; *t-elwa-ne'* STRONG, FIERCE, lit. MANLY, cf. *lua* above; *k-itsol'-ne* TWISTED, cf. plur. *k-itsol'-ti-ne*) : Chim. *-ni*, *-n*, « present » durative verb suffix, also adjectival (e.g. *asi-n alla* DAY-SUN, cf. *asi* DAY; *a-tcxum-ni* DRY, *hiqu'i-ni* SWEET, *lu'yui-n* SMOOTH, *cidji'i-n* WET). I suspect that this Hokan *-ni* is primarily durative intransitive (or better static).
28. Sal. *-i-*, imperative suffix with third person pronominal object (e.g. *m-alel-i-k* ASK HIM !): Yana *-i'*, imperative suffix.

Perhaps the most fundamental and persistent Hokan feature of Salinan is the great preponderance of stems with initial vowel. In this respect Salinan, like Shastan, Chimariko, and Yuman, stands on a more archaic footing than

Yana and most Pomo dialects, in which the initial vowel is generally elided. As in other Hokan languages, and as in Coahuiltecan, there is an interchange in Salinan between the stem form with initial vowel and with elided vowel. Thus, *aton-o* HIS YOUNGER SISTER but *ton'* MY YOUNGER SISTER (Mason's « nominal prefix » *a-* is merely an abstracted stem initial; cf. Achomawi *atun* YOUNGER BROTHER); *asak'a* FLINT but *t-cik*, *t-ca'k* KNIFE (Hokan **axaka* and **xaka*). The disappearance of the vowel is, no doubt, conditioned by an old shift of accent (*a'xa* WATER, whence Tonkawa *ax*; *axa'-na* TO DRINK, whence Tonkawa *xana*). All in all, there can be no reasonable doubt that Salinan is a Hokan language, in all probability a more typical one than Yana. A somewhat involved morphology and the obscuring operation of a number of phonetic laws had prevented its proper classification at the time the Hokan group was set up.

I feel just as little doubt that Washo is a Hokan language. The evidence recently presented for this hypothesis by Dixon and Kroeber and by myself¹ is difficult to explain away. Morphologically Washo is quite close to the North Hokan group that includes Shastan, Chimariko, and Karok. It has no specific points of resemblance to Yana, such parallels as it exhibits being shared by other more remote languages of the stock. Both Yana and Washo, for instance, have a set of local suffixes in the verb, but this feature, which has disappeared or all but disappeared in Pomo, is also found in Karok, Shastan, and Chimariko. It agrees with Pomo and the North Hokan languages in its instrumental verb prefixes and its nominal postpositions; these features mark it off from Yana and Salinan. As regards the treatment of the old Hokan initial vowels, Washo is exactly on the same footing as Salinan. It preserves them as a rule (e.g.

d-i'be NECK: Walapai *ipuk*, Tonkawa *hepeia'*; *eu* TO EAT, contrast E. Pomo *wa*; *d-i'yek* TOOTH: Yuman *iyau*, Comecrudo *i'y*, contrast E. Pomo *yao'*) and is thus, in this important respect, more archaic than Yana itself. Lexically Washo is no closer to Yana than to Pomo, Chimariko, and Yuman; indeed, it is less close. What evidence we have, therefore, is to the effect that the Hokan-like aspect of Washo is not a secondary feature of the language due to the influence of Yana, the nearest recognized Hokan language, but is due to the fact that it has preserved a large number of fundamental Hokan stems and morphological characteristics.

Its geographical position is interesting and important. It stands as a Hokan waif at the western end of the Great Basin. Like its close relatives in California, it was cut off from the Coahuiltecan area and the Yuman tribes to the south by the movements of Athapascan and Shoshonean peoples. Within California itself it is reasonable to suppose that an old Washo-Pomo-Yana continuum was broken up by the southward movement of Penutian tribes, so that Washo and Pomo now stand as Hokan islands. This southward drift of the Penutian group is rendered plausible by the affiliation of these languages with Takelma, Coos, and certain other languages of Oregon and beyond. The proof for this I hope to give in another paper.

It is not at all probable that the Hokan-Coahuiltecan group as at present defined is more than a temporary adumbration of some larger grouping that may be expected to result from closer study. The isolation of Chontal and the presence of a number of Pueblo languages between the Colorado and the Gulf that still await study suggest that the picture may yet be filled in. And to the east it is not impossible that Atakapa may prove to be a link between Coahuiltecan and the Tunica group. But all this is for the future.

1. Dixon and Kroeber, *Linguistic Families of California*, UCP 16: 47-118 (1919); see pp. 104-112.